LABOUR MONTHLY

1s.

EDITOR . R PALME DUTT

SAVE PEACE— SAVE BRITAIN

APRIL, 1948

A MAGAZINE OF INTERNATIONAL LABOUR

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XXX. No. 4 CONTENTS April, 1948

Page

Notes of the Month: *Save Peace—Save Britain* by R. P. D. ... 97

Mad as a March Scare by IVOR MONTAGU 105

The Offensive Against Labour Unity by HARRY ADAMS ... 108

Harold Grenfell by R. PALME DUTT 111

Press Freedom 113

Germany and Marxism: Speech by Colonel Tulpanov 120

100 Years Ago—The Prague Insurrection 123

Book Reviews—

The Twentieth Century Test, 1884-1912 (Third Volume of the History of *The Times*): *W. Rust* 125

Housing and the Family, M. J. Elsas: *Noreen Branson* ... 127

The Quality of Education, Edited by Denys Thompson and James Reeves: *A. G. P.* ... 128

NEWS FROM LABOUR MONTHLY READERS

One way and another we have received a good deal of news from "Labour Monthly" readers this month. News—and views, too. There has been such a heavy postbag, that we have felt the need to use some of our precious space to answer some of the points raised.

For instance, we have received many compliments about the Marx Centenary March number, with its beautiful cover and illustrations. A bookshop manager writes: "As soon as customers saw it, they went for it in a big way." And, we may add, as soon as they had read it, orders began to pour in. So heavy was the demand that some people had to wait, unfortunately. Probably there will be the same keen interest for the special May number. It would be safer to order it now from bookshop or newsagent and not risk delay or failing to get it at all.

A few copies of "Trade Unions and Communism" by Arthur Horner (price 3d) may still be obtained on order. This powerful warning by the Miners' Secretary against splitting is a reprint, with additions, from the brilliant article in the February number.

A reader writes: "In these stormy times the lead of the 'Labour Monthly' is invaluable. I hope it will be as helpful to many as it was

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Save Peace—Save Britain

THE Red Light is showing for Britain. March, 1948, has brought two warning signals for the future. The first is the Government's Economic Survey for 1948. The second is the Western Military Pact signed at Brussels. In Paris and in Brussels, alliances and alignments are being prepared which may bring a grim harvest in the coming years. The Economic Survey has not only revealed the depth of the bankruptcy to which the Churchill-Bevin policy has reduced Britain. It has also declared explicitly for the first time that the Government has no solution for this bankruptcy save to depend on the United States, and thereby has implicitly accepted beforehand whatever conditions the United States chooses to impose. The second warning signal necessarily follows from the first. Just as the Paris Conference lines up the nations in the pay of the United States, so the Brussels Military Pact is the first concrete step, in fulfilment of the real aims of the Marshall Plan, and in advance of any Marshall "aid", to line up the Marshall countries as cannon fodder under the effective control of the American general staff. The Rake's Progress of the past three years is approaching its climax, and President Truman's war statement of March 17 has underlined the provocative character of the policy that is being followed. The immediate offensive is now concentrated against the freedom of elections in Italy; but the same offensive is in fact directed against the freedom of every nation in Europe. The war drums are being beaten to a crescendo of delirium, in the hope to terrorise the peoples into submission.

Paris and Brussels

American imports by the grace of Marshall and Horace Wilson are not only Forever Amber. They are also the orgy of the anti-Red witch-hunt, anti-Soviet incitement and Third World War hysteria. But Britain in its perilous economic condition can less afford these luxuries than the United States. Under cover of a wave of anti-communist and anti-Soviet denunciation and bellicose frenzy the nations of Western Europe are being herded into the pen. For what? For "recovery"? The irrepressible Senator Taft proposed that the pretence of "recovery" should be dropped, and that the aim of an anti-communist anti-Soviet bloc should be plainly recognised; 31 senators supported his amendment; but the remaining 56 recognised that this would be too tactless. Characteristically the Brussels Military Pact has preceded the Paris Conference for economic and political co-ordination and for the integration of Western Germany in the Western Bloc. The economic and political contradictions are less easily ironed out, even with the aid of the powerful baton of the American impresario. But the military

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and strategic objectives are tolerably clear. Sixteen deficits, even when added together, do not make a surplus. But sixteen armies and air forces, added together, can make a tolerable task force for an American commander. The price of the Marshall Plan is not only the surrender of economic and political freedom. It is also the surrender of military freedom.

Which Red Light?

Contrary to the impression which might be gained by an earnest student of platform speeches and the press, the Red Light which is threatening Britain today is not the Red Light of a mythical "Communist spectre" or the "aggression of the Russian Colossus" or the "clutching hand of totalitarianism". These are the highly decorated toys and baubles with which Government Ministers, Tory leaders and the press millionaires are endeavouring to harrow the nerves of the innocent and conceal the bankruptcy of their own policies. The real Red Light which looms threateningly over Britain today is the Red Light of economic catastrophe in pursuit of a crazy war policy. It is the Red Light of deepening economic decline: sliding into passive acceptance of permanent decay and lowered standards; sinking into colonial dependence; and finally staggering or dragged into war. This is the menace against which it is necessary to rally the nation. *The fight for Britain's economic recovery is merging into the fight for peace. The broad rally for peace and international democratic co-operation, for which Henry Wallace is winning millions in the United States, is no less urgent, within the conditions of the different political forms, in Britain.*

Whom the Gods wish to Destroy

Amid the encircling economic gloom all the mad dogs of the top-level Tory-Labour Alliance are baying and yelping for the blood of Bolshevism. Smitten with economic paralysis at home, they dream of grandiose adventures abroad to restore reaction in the far continents of the world. If they cannot bring a tremor to the nerves of a Red Army general abroad, they can always sack a little girl in the civil service at home. That American imperialism should enjoy its brief heyday to brandish its fist in the face of the world is comprehensible. But official Britain offers the comic relief to the picture by providing a farcical spectacle of megalomaniac delusions alternating with distressing punctures and deflation. One day the Government's Economic Survey parades the gaping deficits of the pauper client. Next day Members of Parliament are demanding the extended deployment of the Air Force to bomb Baku or the Don Basin. One day official paid advertisements in every newspaper are exhorting the people to go short and sweat in order to increase exports as the only way to obtain imports of food and raw materials. Next day the same newspapers are boasting of the successful arrival of exports, unpaid, of rifles, machine guns and fighting planes to Greece, or of the two million pounds subsidy to the Transjordanian Army. One day

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ministers are explaining that the desperate shortage of manpower makes essential the importation of foreign labour of hundreds of thousands of displaced Europeans, often of highly doubtful political antecedents. Next day the same Ministers are discussing high-flown schemes for the mass migration of millions from Britain to the ends of the earth as the only way to tackle the insoluble problem of over-population of this crowded island. Over all the feast of economic lunacy and bellicose extravagance worthy Sir Stiggins presides and preaches his puritanical homilies to the multitude to draw in their belts and think of the higher spiritual values.

Anti-Communist Fury

All these contradictions are characteristic contradictions of a dying imperialist order—or rather, of a dying imperialist metropolis, which has lost its old economic basis (though not yet its habit of judging and giving orders to the rest of the world), but whose people have not yet found the way to free themselves from bondage and build their new society. The venomous anti-communist fury of the rulers of this dying imperialism and their hangers-on is only the reflection of these contradictions: the expression of their sense of frustration, bankruptcy, fiasco and angry impotence in face of the rising success and strength of the new world of the working people, building their new society under the leadership of communism. It is obvious that it must be galling to the lords of monopoly and privilege, conscious of their shrinking world domination, to see the advance of socialism and communism in Europe. But it is almost more galling to their servitors in the labour movement, to those who have preached the abstract ideas of socialism for half a century and served capitalism in practice, to see the communism which they always denounced, no longer in one country only, but in country after country, leading forward the working people to victory over capitalism and the building of socialism, while, as Morgan Phillips has so aptly put it, "Social Democracy has never succeeded anywhere". Hence the combined front of fury of the Churchills and Attlees, the Vansittarts and Bevins, the Halifaxes and Morrisons. But it is also not surprising that, so long as this is the picture of post-war Britain, the peoples of the new democracies in Europe, who have got rid of their landlords and monopolists, and are successfully planning and rebuilding their countries, should regard with rather less than respect the lectures which our Morrisons and Vansittarts think fit to address them.

"Let Them Rave"

Twenty-eight years ago Lenin wrote of this anti-communist fury of the old dying world, which followed the Bolshevik Revolution:

> At present the millionaires of all countries are behaving on an international scale in such a manner as to deserve our heartiest thanks. They are hunting down Bolshevism with the same zeal as did Kerensky and Co.; they are "overdoing" it and *helping* us quite as much as did Kerensky.... When the American bourgeoisie, having completely lost its head, seizes thousands and thousands of people upon suspicion of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bolshevism and creates an atmosphere of panic spreading broadcast alarm of Bolshevik plots; when the British bourgeoisie—the most "solid" in the world—commits acts of incredible stupidity . . . we must bow and thank these worthy capitalists. They are working for us. They are helping to get the masses interested in the question of the nature and significance of Bolshevism.

Lenin continued later in the same passage:

Let the bourgeoisie rave, work itself into a frenzy, overdo things, commit stupidities, take vengeance on the Bolsheviks in advance and endeavour to kill off (in India, Hungary, Germany, etc.) hundreds, thousands, and hundreds of thousands more of yesterday's and tomorrow's Bolsheviks. Acting thus, the bourgeoisie acts as all classes doomed by history have acted. Communists should know that the future at any rate belongs to them.

And he concluded with a famous piece of advice which has lost none of its appositeness today:

In all cases and in all countries Communism is becoming steeled and is growing; its roots are so deep that persecution neither weakens nor debilitates it; rather does it strengthen it. Only one thing is lacking to enable us to march forward more surely and more firmly towards victory, namely, the full and completely thought out conviction on the part of all Communists in all countries of the necessity of displaying maximum *flexbility* in tactics.

That was twenty-eight years ago. Since then Communism has not only grown enormously in strength, extent, mass influence and political experience, as well as in the measure of victories won; the leading Communist Parties have notably advanced in the mastery of precisely that "flexibility" which Lenin recommended, as signally demonstrated in the People's Republics in Europe. With this further advance the fury of the bourgeoisie after the second world war has reached a stage of panic stricken paroxysm without precedent. We are twenty-eight years further along the road. And they know it.

Czechoslovakia

It is only in this context can be understood the extraordinary maniac outburst of rage which has greeted the victory of the working class and popular forces in Czechoslovakia. It might have been thought that the establishment of a united Socialist-Communist Government on the basis of an indisputably freely elected parliamentary majority, with the backing of a united trade union movement and the factory councils throughout the country, engaged in nationalising the whole field of industry, would have been regarded by every man and woman of the labour movement as a marvellous triumph of democracy, socialism and the peaceful transition to the new socialist order. On the contrary, it has been met with a universal howl of despair and lamentation, not merely from the *Daily Mail* and the Kemsley Press and Mr. Churchill and the Economic League, but equally and in identical terms from the *Daily Herald* and the "socialist" *Tribune* and Mr. Attlee and Mr. Morrison and the entire official leadership of the Labour Party, as if the end of the world had come. Indeed, Mr. Morrison has gone so far as to call for a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

" resistance movement " against the new Government in Czechoslovakia, " with the same resources and initiative and sacrifice as in the war against Hitler "—in other words, for an illegal fascist movement to revolt against a Government based on an elected parliamentary majority. The shades of Carson may well turn pale with envy at his new disciple, and Mosley smile approval.

Democracy in the Gold Coast

The detached observer who might seek to understand this outburst from the standpoint of pure democracy would find himself at a considerable loss. He would be bewildered by the frequent references to " Munich "—especially from prominent Munichites—as the essence of Munich was the armed invasion and carving up of Czechoslovakia, with the connivance of two traitor Powers, and in this case not a soldier moved, not an inch of Czechoslovak territory was violated. In this respect he could only reach the conclusion that the special anger of the Munichites must be because this time their intended second Munich at the expense of Czechoslovakia was defeated. He would be even more puzzled at the frequent references to canons of "democracy", since at the very same moment as Labour Ministers were engaged in these expressions of outrage and indignation on behalf of the principles of pure "democracy", they were simultaneously engaged in publicly approving the shooting down and killing under their authority of numerous Gold Coast ex-servicemen who had dared to endeavour to present a petition to the Governor, and so far from protesting at this violation of democracy, they preferred to denounce the agitation of the Gold Coast people as " a communist plot". Our detached observer might find this contradictory stand on "democracy" hypocritical. But in practice, of course, there is no contradiction, so soon as we look behind juridical forms to class realities. In Czechoslovakia the propertied interests were outraged by the victory of the working class and advance of nationalisation. In the Gold Coast the propertied interests were outraged by the threat of popular democratic agitation to imperialist domination. In each case the common link, uniting the attitude of the Labour imperialists in both cases, has, of course, nothing to do with democracy, but is the protection of propertied and imperialist interests. And, to drive home the lesson, open threats are being directed against the Italian people, warships are being brought up, troops massed on the borders, and President Truman talks of war, if the Italian people should dare to elect a Socialist-Communist majority.

" Physician, Heal Thyself "

The time may yet come—in fact, will come (in spite of the cynics and sceptics)—when the British Labour Movement will be engaged in the task of ousting the landlords and capitalists. That time has not yet come; the capitalists have made bigger profits than ever under a Labour Government; and no step has yet been taken to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

socialism; indeed, Dalton has recently called attention to the interesting result of nationalisation so far in respect of capital ownership that

> as a result of our nationalisation measures already passed, gilt-edged stocks quoted on the Stock Exchange will soon have increased from £15,000 million to £17,000 million, and "other securities" reduced from £13,000 million to £11,000 million. (Hugh Dalton, *New Statesman and Nation*, 21.2.48)

i.e. the total of £28,000 million of capital stocks ownership will have remained *exactly unchanged*. But sooner or later that job will have to be tackled; and when that time comes, the Labour Movement may find that, to overcome resistance, it may need to depend, not merely on parliamentary votes, but on the working class in the factories and a socialist police force, and may have to ride roughshod over some juridical niceties in the interests of real democracy. When our movement has shown itself capable of tackling that job, it can lecture other movements—not before. Meanwhile that time has not yet come. The Labour Government has only been called on to fulfil a very much more elementary task: to carry through a measure of democratic post-war reconstruction, which will not lay the burdens of the crisis on the workers, and will not enslave the country to the American monopolists. How far have they succeeded in fulfilling even this elementary task—a hundred times behind the level of the social reconstruction already accomplished by the People's Governments in progressive democratic Europe? Let the Economic Survey answer.

Economic Survey's Indictment

The Economic Survey for 1948 is important, not only for the facts and estimates it reveals (often with significant gaps, as over shipbuilding), but also for the declaration of policy it lays bare. Periodically the bill for Mr. Bevin comes in, and each time the nation is revealed deeper in bankruptcy. The deficit of £380 million in 1946 has become a deficit of £675 million in 1947. Of this deficit of £1,055 million over two years, no less than £874 million, or *over four fifths, is gross Government overseas expenditure*, of which no less than £593 million, that is, 56 *per cent. of the total two years' deficit, is Government overseas military expenditure*. There is the price of Mr. Bevin in the Government's own figures. Previous official returns had indicated (and to this we have made frequent reference in these Notes) that three-quarters of the deficit of 1946 was represented by Government overseas expenditure. But now the new return reveals that this was an under-statement, and that the picture was made too favourable. The new return reveals that Government overseas military expenditure in 1946, amounting to £382 million, was actually more than the total deficit on the balance of payments, given as £380 million, and that thus *the entire deficit of* 1946 *was due to Government overseas military expenditure*. This is very powerful corroboration of the analysis we have made of the basic *policy* factors (not mere inevitable objective factors through war destruction, the rise in world prices and the weakening of Britain's imperialist position) underlying Britain's post-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war economic dilemmas. Yet the " Short Economic Survey", issued for popular consumption as a supposed summary of the White Paper, *entirely omits the figures of military expenditure*—that is, the cardinal figures for understanding the problem.

A Policy of Surrender

Even more important is the Survey's demonstration of the Government's bankruptcy of policy. The Survey estimates that Britain's gold and dollar reserves had fallen to £680 million by the beginning of this year, would fall to £450 million by this summer, and at the same rate would reach exhaustion by the first half of 1949 (present indications would suggest that even this may be too favourable an estimate). What is the Government's policy to meet this situation? The Government offers no policy save to depend on United States aid. " Without further substantial external aid we can have no hope of recovering equilibrium at a reasonable standard of life within the next few years." " The Survey assumes, as a basis of general policy and planning, that aid will in some form be available." Previously every Government statement used to insist that the programme for recovery was being calculated entirely independent of whether there would or would not be further dollar aid after the exhaustion of the United States loan. Our accusations, voiced in these Notes and by other critics, that the Government's calculations were really based on the assumption of further dollar aid (with all that that would mean in further dependence), were hotly denied. All this pretence has now been thrown to the winds. The Rake's Progress has ended in the docility of the Pauper Pensioner.

" No Alternative "

What effect is this confession of helplessness likely to have on the hard-faced business men across the Atlantic who have already used every weapon of advantage during these post-war years to tighten the stranglehold on their dear British cousin? What kind of bargain is a negotiator likely to reach who enters the council chamber with a preliminary declaration that he has no alternative save to accept whatever terms are imposed? " No alternative " is the classic formula of Petain, of capitulation, as we pointed out already in these Notes in January, 1946, in dismissing the " no alternative " argument for accepting the original United States loan. Now the logic of " no alternative " is reaching its grim outcome. Its preliminary consequences are illustrated in the ruinous Film Agreement, withdrawing the 75 per cent. levy within a few days of the Survey's declaration of desperate dollar shortage, and setting the model for United States capital penetration in Britain.

Paying the Price

With frivolous irresponsibility the Survey calculates on Marshall aid to meet Britain's gap. But the Survey does not stop to calculate the price of Marshall aid. That price is already revealing itself in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

economic field, in shipbuilding, in the steel situation, in Empire trade relations, in the Ruhr. It reveals itself in the political field, where the Attlee ban in the Civil Service is the first open step to the "gleichschaltung" of Britain in accordance with American administrative decrees. It reveals itself in the diplomatic field, where the Paris Conference of the Sixteen obediently reports to the American paymaster. And it reveals itself in the military field, where the admitted principle of "British manpower and American dollars" continues to exact the blood tribute of the satellite.

What the Drain Means

But this continuation of overseas military expenditure and draining of resources and manpower prolongs the heaviest cause of the economic deficit, thus leading to an endless descending spiral of renewed deficit and renewed dependence. This is demonstrated even by the Survey's own estimates. For the first half of 1948 the Survey estimates an overall deficit of £136 million, equivalent to an annual rate of £272 million. What is the main item in this deficit? Of the total £136 million for the half year, the Survey estimates that Government overseas expenditure will amount to no less than £97 million, or 71 per cent. of the whole deficit. Overseas military expenditure is estimated at £70 million, or over half the total deficit on the balance of payments—actually a higher proportion than in 1947. Supposing that we were to omit Government overseas expenditure, the real deficit would then amount to £39 million, equivalent to £78 million for the year. This would already obviously be by comparison a more manageable figure. But more than this. The manpower returns estimate a total of 1,300,000 for Defence purposes by the end of 1948, alongside unemployment of 450,000—making a total of one and three-quarter millions withdrawn from production. If this figure were reduced to three-quarters of a million, and one million were restored to production, then, on the average estimate of £300 value net output per head, this would represent £300 million potential production. Assuming half of this were allocated to exports, it would represent twice the amount of the deficit, that is, leave room for increased imports required for the increased production, and still leave £150 million production for increased consumption at home or restoration of an important proportion of the capital cuts. All this is, however, dependent on a basic change of policy.

Reversing the Rake's Progress

These figures can, of course, only have an illustrative value for argument; since a real alternative would need to be worked out concretely in terms of alternative sources of supply, markets and organisation of production at home. But such an alternative plan has, in fact, been worked out in the Communist Party's "Plan for Prosperity", which holds the field. The Survey makes no attempt even to examine alternative possibilities (prospects of trade with the Soviet Union are conspicuously ignored), and thus reveals itself, not as a serious Survey,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but in the final analysis as a mere propaganda pamphlet for the Marshall Plan as supposedly inevitable, that is, for dependence on the United States and a ruinous foreign policy. It is precisely this fatal policy which it is now essential to reverse. This is the key equally to Britain's economic recovery, to the restoration of Britain's independence and to the victory of the fight for peace.

March 18, 1948. R. P. D.

MAD AS A MARCH SCARE

By IVOR MONTAGU

THE Czechoslovak crime and crisis has certainly thrown a flood of light on matters. If there were any illusions among simpletons about how the men of property and their jackals would fight to cling onto their moneybags, about their readiness in that fight to jettison every vestige of honour, truth, decency, constitutionalism or other vaunted moral value, such illusions must now fly out of the window.

Never, and I mean never, has there been in history such a spate of dishonesty, hypocrisy, misrepresentation, slander. Not *one* capitalist newspaper, not *one* bourgeois statesman, raised a voice to stem it.

My private gem was the scare report, almost universally headlined, that " the flag of President Benes on his palace was hauled down today as he left the capital under guard for his country home"; a report which could be headlined about the King of England every time he and his family go to Windsor.

What indeed did happen in Czechoslovakia? What happened was denounced in the name of democracy. Yet what happened was not only perfectly democratic, it was constitutional; and not only according to the Czech constitution but would equally have been so according to the British or "Western" forms of constitution as well. That's what sticks in their gullets.

A coalition. 12 ministers resign. The Prime Minister, representing a majority in Parliament, informs the President that he is ready to reconstruct the Government on the basis of his majority. After some hesitation, during which both the President and opposition politicians who are trying to bring pressure on him privately are left in no doubt as to what is the genuine will of the people on the issues, the President agrees. No murders. No violence. No bloodshed. Not even one Russian soldier and no snow on anyone's boots. What is there to offend the most prudish of democracies, the most democratic of constitutions in any of this? What to evoke the frenzy and dancing? One thing and one alone: the majority and the will of the people alike stood behind the Communist Party and the solution of the crisis is likely to result in the triumph of that very Socialism to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which the British labour leaders pay lip service and which they spend twenty-four hours daily trying to prevent coming to pass.

Hungary, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Poland, Bulgaria—all the scruples of these gentry about the elections in these places are shown up for what they are worth. The validity of the Czechoslovak elections was never questioned, yet when the admitted minority provoked a crisis and the elected majority decided the solution, that still did not please these gentlemen.

It is enlightening to examine what they consider "democratic".

In France, three parties won an election on a joint programme. A "democratic" government was formed, in which the smallest party of the three held the Premiership and all the most important offices, while the largest party was excluded from any effective power. Finally, the minority Premier himself provokes a crisis, expels from his cabinet all members of the majority party, alters the electoral system to its disadvantage before the next election, and excludes its members even from office in the localities. All this under public pressure and promise of bribery emanating publicly from a foreign state. This process was neither "undemocratic" nor a violation of sovereignty. It was *against* Communists.

In Italy, the identical pattern of coalition, external pressure and betrayal—except that in this case (as in Prague) the overwhelming majority of the Socialist Party (brother party of the British Labour Party) remained loyal to the commonly agreed policy and the Communist alliance—so here it got kicked out as well. And what difference did this make to the British Labour Party leaders? Merely that these, who with straight faces denounce the Communists as "splitters", decided to recognise as "democrats" only those Socialists who belong to a splinter they persuaded to split away.

Or see here: another kind of "democracy". In Britain and in U.S.A. the elections recorded decisive popular victories respectively FOR Labour policy VERSUS the Tories headed by Churchill, FOR Roosevelt and his principles VERSUS the policy of the Republican candidate and his close adviser Dulles. There has been no new General or Presidential Election. Yet what have the electorates in these two "democratic" States now got? Governments that in every essential respect, home and foreign, are following the policies outlined by Churchill and prescribed by Dulles and applauded by Tory and Republican leaderships. Does anybody suppose that if Attlee, Morrison and Bevin had gone to the country with a policy including: subordination of command of the British armed forces to the U.S. General Staff, Western military alliance against U.S.S.R., maintenance of the Nazi business men and rehabilitation of the Ruhr under private ownership, severance of relations with every continental socialist party that refused to endorse this, brake on capital equipment, on living and on health, abandonment of steel nationalisation, restriction of shipbuilding at the request of its competitors, police protection for fascists and strike-breakers, arming of Arabs against the Jews, freezing of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wages and appeals for voluntary restraint from capitalists in respect to prices and profits—they would have received the support of ONE Labour voter? Yet this is the policy they have given us. And this—not what has happened in Czechoslovakia — is "democracy" according to *their* dictionary. It does not matter whether the opponent keeps the rules of the game or no. All that matters to them is that he should lose. And their opponent is Socialism. If they call it "Communism", it is only because the Communists are the Socialists who mean business.

The cause of their frenzy is plain enough. These pygmies in Downing Street and Wall Street are harried, hurried, frightened men. Molotov told them a home truth that scared the pants off them. Not that one about the "atomic bomb no longer being a secret". They had reconciled themselves to that, for all their bluster. But the other one, "All roads lead to Communism". They had never appreciated it in that light before, but it is so. Keep the party clean, maintain the rules and liberties of democracy—and the facts of life, the crises of capitalism, the triumphs of Socialism, will presently open the eyes of the people. Establish tyranny or go to war—and the indignation of mankind, despite whatever necessary agonies and efforts, will sooner or later sweep you into the dustbin. Leave the nations free, they will find their own path. Enchain them, and unite their peoples in fury against you.

They are hurried men because their sands are running out. Soon there will be a solid block in which the people own their own countries and are masters of their own fate stretching from Europe to the Pacific. Soon more than half mankind will be lost to capitalist exploitation. While the Downing Street-Wall Street Axis-mongers face an economic crisis they cannot solve, a growing unpopularity they cannot stem. Their most desperate efforts only unite more and more decent people in the camp resisting them. And what can they do? Collect the riff-raff spewed out of the various territories in their march to Socialism, as they did the Miliukovs and Kerenskies from Russia thirty years ago? That army will frighten nobody. Their money buys only the sort of filth that can be bought, the incorruptibles remain on the other side. For all their screeching, Communism brings prosperity and opportunity, happiness and release to human genius, while their way of life depends on lynching and lying, the "equality of freedom" of Mississippi and the Gold Coast, and ends in chaos, unemployment and war.

The shouts about "saving France" uttered by those who joined Petain in selling it to the Nazis are as ineffective as the cries about a "new Munich" from the Labour leaders who applauded Chamberlain when he went to visit Hitler. The Communist electorate remains the largest in France, vital heart of the "Westbloc". And the more Morgan Phillips denounces the Communists, the more solidly the votes of the Trade Unions reaffirm confidence in them. Labour leaders denounce the Czechs for purging the diplomatic service and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only make them popular in the eyes of those numerous Labour Party followers whose dear wish it was that Bevin should do the same with the Foreign Office. They denounce the "Communist coup" and "Russian interference" in Prague, while in Rome they openly send emissaries ranging from Jowett to Phillips, Washington warns that credits will be withdrawn, and the U.S.-subsidised Hierarchy warns of hell-fire, and yet what they are interfering and warning and trembling about in Italy is not a coup at all, but the expression of popular will at an election which their own nominees are conducting!

Not nice people—No. They hound Jan Masaryk to death, and then praise his wit and his democracy, though their papers from first to last have not printed one word of the speeches he had been making at U.N.O. for two years, consistently exposing them with democratic wit. Morrison calls for a new Resistance Movement before the assembled Jewellers of Birmingham; while the American Generals in Trizonia acquit Nazis who shot and tortured those who resisted Hitler.

And they will be less nice still. They have embarked on a programme that cannot work—the rescue of capitalism. Like the bankrupt who is drawn further and further into embezzlement and crime in the effort to avoid discovery and stave off ruin, so they are ready to sacrifice every cherished principle of truth, freedom and fair dealing in the effort to discredit the Communists around whom the people gather. If the Communists try a man and he admit his guilt to an open court, yet this is "oppression". But *they* can slander, sack and expel Communists without trial and without defence. However, they cannot win. There is a Carey Street waiting for them not far down the road, and also a Jack Ketch.

THE OFFENSIVE AGAINST LABOUR UNITY

By HARRY ADAMS

[Following on the article by Arthur Horner in our February issue, we are pleased to print this communication from a veteran trade union leader, who as many readers will know, is Chairman of the Amalgamated Union of Building Trade Workers.—Ed. L.M.]

REGARDING the recent outburst by the Labour Party leadership, I agree with Arthur Horner that the effect was likely to lead to a weakening of the Trade Union Movement at a time when the greatest unity is necessary, but fortunately the membership of the trade unions does not appear to be taking much notice of the "splitting" advice given.

The reference by Morgan Phillips to infiltration is sheer nonsense. The facts as I see them in the building industry are that almost

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every member of the Communist Party was a trade unionist first, and that every member of the party who has been elected to an official position in either of the trade unions has been elected on account of his activities on behalf of his fellows irrespective of political considerations, except, of course, that a Marxist is more likely to see and take a correct line.

As to what actuated the "attack", my opinion is that it arises primarily from the fact that the majority of the Labour Party leadership are either " anti " or " non " Marxists prepared to take any step which would prevent their party from being associated in any way with a policy based upon the class struggle. They cannot deny that such a struggle exists, because the trade unions and the action of those trade unions in establishing an independent political organ is concrete evidence of its existence.

It is true to say that a majority of trade unionists have not a clearly developed and intelligent conception of the struggle and/or the line to take to reach a classless society, otherwise Phillips and his ilk would not be occupying important positions. Nevertheless there is a sufficient understanding to ensure support if a correct lead were given by those elected to top rank Industrial and Political office. Actually the present policy of the Labour Government in both home and foreign affairs is the logical outcome of the policy followed from 1899.

The outward expression of working class revolt against Liberal and Tory parties was the setting up, by the Trades Union Congress, of the Labour Representation Committee which afterwards (in 1906) became the Labour Party; but the workers themselves, and particularly those who were members of the Labour Party by payment of a Political Levy through the trade unions, failed to develop from below a policy that was consistent with the action taken at that time. Later on (in 1918) when the Individual Membership Section was formed, very little advantage was taken of the opportunity by trade unionists to become members of the section and thereby seek to determine policy and control the Party's activities.

I am not unaware of the ruthless actions of the leadership at the time because I was a victim of the exclusions policy, although I was not a member of the Communist Party. But if thousands more of the trade unionists of that time had, like me and a relatively few others who supported us from outside, accepted similar obligations inside the Individual Membership Section, it might have been different. This same lack of interest and failure to accept personal and co-operative responsibility by trade unionists made it possible for the leadership to renounce its international obligations in 1914 and six years later to exclude from the Labour Party those members of the British Socialist Party (formerly Social Democratic Party) who became members of the Communist Party on its formation in 1920, despite the fact that they were, as members of the British Socialist Party previously, affiliated to the Labour Party. This led still later on to other exclusions, the promulgation of the " black circular ", etc.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is no doubt in my mind that notwithstanding all these setbacks and disappointments the Labour Party can become what some of us who were in at the beginning expected it to be, viz., a mass party of the workers in the widest possible sense, to be used for the overthrow of Capitalism and Landlordism along the line of the Communist Manifesto leading to a Socialist Society. The word "Communist" caused no more disturbance of mind in those days than the words "Socialist" or "Radical": but to the extent that the Labour Party has wilfully or ignorantly deviated from the line of the class struggle it has been necessary for those who determined policy to indulge in the denunciation and exclusion of those who advocated keeping to that line whether they labelled themselves Communists or not. Where proof of membership of the Communist Party was not found, the use of the words "crypto" and "near" and "fellow travellers" arose to describe dissentients from official policy and decisions.

I do not intend to enter into verbal or written discussion on the policy of the present Government, because I fail to see what else they can be expected to do. Refusal to follow the line of the class struggle naturally leaves only the alternative of association with those who wish to maintain a two-class society with all its hideous features:

War and the threats of war.

Hostility to the Soviet Union and the new Eastern European democracies.

Interference in Greece to prevent the Resistance Movement that had been gallantly fighting Fascism, from taking over the Government. All the horrible consequences that have followed that action.

All other similar facets of foreign policy as are designed to maintain imperialism irrespective of the rights of other peoples.

Eulogy of the U.S.A. as a young, virile democracy, despite the treatment of coloured people whose ancestors were torn away from their homes in Africa to be the slaves of the founders of this so-called democracy —despite the recent Act of oppression against the trade unions, not forgetting previous similar acts, the abrupt termination of Lease-Lend and removal of price controls.

All this we shall continue to have until the membership of the trade unions accept their personal and co-operative responsibilities as members of the working class. Those who are members of the Labour Party are being blackmailed into acceptance of present policy because they fear a return to Toryism, whereas they should be seeking in a perfectly constitutional way a change in both policy and leadership.

Those millions of trade unionists at present outside the Labour Party should be induced by persistent propaganda to get inside and assist in this task. Those thousands of organised workers and professional people who have quite correctly and justifiably set up a political party based upon the class struggle should be able to take their place inside the Labour Party and this can be done if the suggestions I make above are carried out. The line of "Parliamentary Democracy" interpreted as subservience to "Dollar Democracy" will, of course, attract the "nice" people and those afraid of getting hurt.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The line of the Communist Manifesto will attract all those with courage to prosecute the struggle whether they get hurt or not or whether they use the label of Communist or not. Labels do not count, but fundamental principles count for everything.

HAROLD GRENFELL

By R. PALME DUTT

THE death of Commander H. G. Grenfell, R.N., at the age of 78 years, severs one of the links of Britain with the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. In him we lose one of the most courageous and noble-hearted fighters of the past generation, and a valued friend, contributor and supporter of the LABOUR MONTHLY from its earliest days.

Harold Grenfell, after a career in the Navy since 1883, and in Admiralty Intelligence, was appointed Naval Attaché to the British Embassy in St. Petersburg in 1912, under Sir George Buchanan as Ambassador, and continued in that post, during the war years in Petrograd, until November, 1917. His outspoken democratic views, and his sympathies and close association with the Russian people, breaking through the conventional iron curtain which restricted diplomats to court reactionary circles, brought him into constant conflict with his superiors, but enabled him to reach an exceptional understanding of the real new Russia that was coming to birth. His reports to the Government accurately predicted the coming revolution. Needless to say, his reports were pigeon-holed; the Lloyd George Government preferred to believe the notorious Milner Mission which in the beginning of 1917 solemnly affirmed that there would be no revolution in Russia. From the outbreak of the Revolution he fearlessly identified himself with the popular cause, and in his reports exposed the lies of the Cadets and Right Wing Socialists who sought to depict Lenin and the Bolsheviks as German agents.

After the Bolshevik Revolution he was able, as Head of the British Naval Mission to Finland from December, 1918, to June, 1919, to give valued assistance to the working class and democratic movement in the face of White Terror. But in the summer of 1919 the British Government reached the decision to use Helsinki as the naval base for operations against Soviet Russia:

> Six days ago Mr. Bonar Law, answering a questioner, agreed that the Entente Powers were preparing naval and military operations against Petrograd based on Helsingfors, and that a British squadron had been ordered to Helsingfors. (*The Times*, May 19, 1919).

Grenfell's open opposition to this criminal war of intervention against the young Soviet Republic led to his resignation as Head of the British Naval Mission to Finland and terminated his diplomatic career. Henceforth Grenfell fought in the ranks of the working class movement.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Returning to England, Grenfell threw himself into political activity, and remained a convinced militant socialist of the left wing to the end of his days. His articles in the *Manchester Guardian* and elsewhere in 1919, like those of Phillips Price (also an early friend of the LABOUR MONTHLY) and others, helped to spread understanding of the Bolshevik Revolution. He played an active part in the Hands Off Russia movement, and gave the full value of his services and expert knowledge to the Council of Action in 1920. He accompanied the Trades Union Congress delegation to Russia in 1924 as secretary and advisory delegate, and no small part of the credit in the preparation of its historic Report belongs to him. He was tireless in addressing meetings on behalf of British-Soviet friendship all over the country.

In later years ill-health and difficult economic circumstances limited his activities. During the second world war he volunteered for service with the Admiralty. Even there, in the purely technical work he performed in the Hydrographic Department, official antagonism continued to persecute him, and finally terminated his services and source of income only a few weeks before his death. In the last letter I had from him, on February 11, only a fortnight before his death, in which he made a characteristically generous and selfless donation of five guineas to the LABOUR MONTHLY, he concluded with a for him unwonted pathetic note which seemed to carry a premonition of the end:

> I fear that it may be the last help to the cause that may be in my power to give. My income is steadily lessening (owing to the malevolence of my late immediate superiors in the Hydrographic Department) and the cost of living is even more steadily growing. For the last six months I have not been able to pay my way, and—as things are going—I fear that the situation may be worse before it becomes better.

On February 29 he died.

Through all these years his unquenchable spirit, his lively political awareness, his undying hatred of imperialism and of all the dirty intrigues of its official diplomacy, and his confidence in the victory of the socialist revolution, never weakened. Contact with him was a privilege and an unfailing stimulus. With his close knowledge of the ruling class from the inside, he was merciless in his exposure and judgment of British reactionary policy through the era of Munich, through the war years, and in the present post-war years; and he expressed his views with the frankness of an old naval officer in language which would have burned the page, and ensured instant prosecution, if we had ventured to print his judgment of British policy in the long series of letters he wrote me during these twenty-five years. In that same last letter, a fortnight before his death, the old veteran of seventy-eight years made the most vivid comparison between the present foreign policy of the Labour Government and the record of the Liberal Government of 1906-14, with pen sketches of Asquith and Attlee, Grey and Bevin, and concluded:

> If you ask my opinion, I would answer that now, as then, war has been decided upon by the political forces represented through our F.O., War

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Office and Admiralty, and—as in 1914—those same political forces (themselves based upon "social" influence, the Banks and Big Business, *still* in 1948 the actual ruling factors of this country, as they were in 1914) undoubtedly count on bringing off a second unholy triumph.

Grenfell was one of the original circle of friends and helpers of this journal from its foundation, and his connection continued unbroken for the twenty-seven years of its existence. Among his contributions will be recalled his powerful indictment "Secret Service and the Labour Movement" in August, 1926 (which contrasted the pre-1914 expenditure of £40,000 on Secret Service with its multiplication ten times by 1926—today fifty times as great as before 1914, or £2,000,000), and his vivid memories of the last days of pre-revolutionary Russia under the title "Downfall of Tsarism", reviewing Rodzianko's "The Reign of Rasputin; an Empire in Collapse", on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution in November, 1927. The record of the Guarantee Fund will show how consistent was his material support, beyond his means, in addition to his unfailing counsel and encouragement.

We honour in Harold Grenfell not only a democrat, a socialist and a true fighter, but also a representative of that select band, along with such men as Wilfrid Scawen Blunt (also a firm friend of the LABOUR MONTHLY from its foundation), who in the age of imperialist corruption, from within the ruling class and official circles, dared to voice the "other England", and carried forward the banner of the real glorious liberal tradition of England, which is so shamed and bespattered by its official representatives today, and which will reach its final realisation and victory, as these representatives came to understand, in union with the working class and socialism.

PRESS FREEDOM

[In response to a questionnaire sent by the Royal Commission on the Press, the "Labour Monthly" last year submitted the following replies (available in the third set of Memoranda of Evidence, price 10s.) to the questions asked. The tenor of the questions, e.g. "In what does the Freedom of the Press consist?", or "What is the proper function of a newspaper?" may be gathered from the content of the replies, which we print to meet requests from readers.—Ed. L.M.]

THE Freedom of the Press as the phrase is currently used can give rise to considerable confusion, especially when equated with Free Speech, Freedom of Assembly, etc., all without regard to material conditions or historical circumstances.

Literally taken it might seem to mean that some twenty-three million adults in Great Britain are secure in the right to have each of their views obtaining expression in the Press. This meaning of an unrestricted universal right (by no means excluded from popular conception of the phrase) has clearly no relevance to the newspaper

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Press which is a material organisation and as such is bound to be subject to control: but the mention of this misconception in its most exaggerated form serves to stress the essential point, i.e., the control of the Press; and opens the crucial question of where that control lies or should lie.

A more serious, because more widely prevailing, misconception is found in the current use of the phrase Freedom of the Press as though it applied equally to everything from the 17th to the 20th century, from Milton's Areopagitica to present day controversies. Thus there is created a confusion between the phrase as used to describe the struggle of the 18th and early 19th century for freedom, and the phrase as used by millionaire newspaper proprietors today to cover up their destruction of Press freedom.

By tradition, established in Britain in the age (say 1700-1830) when the newspaper was the organ of various social groups struggling against the rule of a close oligarchy of great landowners, the freedom of the Press has been identified with that of *the individual fighting for free speech in causes which might or might not be popular, but which were distasteful to the ruling class.*

It should be noted, however, that the freedom of the Press which was in certain measure won for those social groups did not, until the very end of the period, i.e., after 1832, include freedom for working men to express their point of view; nor was there ever achieved (nor is there today) the same complete freedom of the Press to advocate an anti-religious point of view as to advocate this or that religion. Thus, even in the classic period of formation of the doctrine of freedom of the Press, its boundaries were strictly limited by those of the stability of the existing form of society. This was made particularly clear during the periods of suspension of Habeas Corpus—those periods when that stability was particularly threatened—namely, 1715-1745, 1797-1815 (for the greater part), 1819-22, etc.

When power in the State, and ultimately the fulness of economic power, was conquered by the modern capitalist class, i.e., in the fourth decade of the 19th century, and still more when capitalist enterprise in the newspaper industry (one of the first manifestations of that economic power, marked by the foundation of the *Daily News,* the *Daily Telegraph,* and a number of provincial papers, in the 40s and 50s) moved on to the monopoly stage at the end of the 19th century, a new meaning was acquired by the conception of "freedom of the Press." To its old meaning was added that of "*freedom of capitalist enterprise to monopolise the means of influencing public opinion, in the age, first of manhood suffrage and ultimately of adult suffrage.*"

Thus, having failed to defeat the fight for the freedom of the Press, the ruling class in their new formation turned to swamping the Press, extending their own control over it and making it into an instrument to dope and deceive the masses of the people—according to the formula given at the Security Council by the Foreign

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secretary (10th February, 1946), viz.: "A newspaper has three things to do: to amuse, to entertain and to mislead."

The fate of the attempts in Great Britain to conduct a workers' newspaper free of capitalist enterprise—the *Daily Citizen* before 1914 and the *Daily Herald* before 1914 and for 10 years after 1919—and the immense difficulties encountered by the *Daily Worker,* only serve to underline the significance of this new meaning of the freedom of the Press, which has appeared in consequence of historical development and in concrete historical conditions. Moreover, it is this meaning which is implied in nine-tenths of what is written today about freedom of the Press, particularly by those who uphold the capitalist system of property—whether they are newspaper owners or not.

This interpretation of Freedom of the Press involves a contradiction in that private capitalist ownership confines control to a tiny minority and deprives the vast majority of any share in control, of any real "freedom of the Press": it constitutes each private owner (or his agent) as a censor, appointed without public choice; and substitutes for the old state censorship a multiple and anarchic censorship without responsibility except to private interests.

However, there are millions of people in this country who have become, or are becoming dissatisfied with the capitalist system of property; and the change to social ownership of the means of production to which they are aspiring necessarily involves also the ending of capitalist enterprise in the Press, and with it of the capitalist interpretation of Press freedom. This involves not the re-establishment of governmental management of the Press as in the 18th century (any more than social ownership of the means of production necessarily means their management by the Government), but *the establishment of social ownership in place of monopoly capitalist ownership; management by persons who in deed, not in word, are responsible to the community, and the transformation of the Press into the mouthpiece and instrument of the free citizen, for whom the affairs of his community, great and small, are as important, precisely because of his sense of ownership, as they were to the citizens of the primitive democracy of ancient Athens.* This, in the twentieth century, is what in our judgment would constitute the freedom of the Press.

The first function of a newspaper is to act as the public place—the Agora—in which the citizen can learn the facts which enable him to exercise his rights as a member of society. But truth in reporting and fulness of information are only the first step. The newspaper, and its editors, have a much wider responsibility; to give a lead to their fellow-citizens, to awaken their conscience and to arouse their energies in the social interest. No such functions can be performed, except by fits and starts and on particular issues, by a newspaper owned by a capitalist monopoly: this has been amply demonstrated by the history of the Press, and it follows from the very nature of capitalist monopoly. Being based upon a profoundly antagonistic mode of production—the securing of profit (surplus value) for the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

individual by purchasing the labour-power of the worker—capitalist monopoly cannot, without destroying itself, strike at either the material or the ideological forms in which the antagonism expresses itself. In the case of the newspaper, this means that its editors, if they wish to retain the confidence of their proprietor or directors, and still more those proprietors, are bound to have a "blind spot" in their field of vision, however honourable their intentions—namely, the field in which the interests of the exploited majority of society come into conflict with the interests of monopoly capital. Whatever partial agreement on particular issues a newspaper owned in this way can establish between the interests of the public (or of its vast majority) and those of its shareholders, it is all the time unable to do so on a number of fundamental issues, and from time to time finds itself unable to do so on many others. It would be sufficient to enquire when any of the leading British newspapers have wholeheartedly and unreservedly supported a great strike of workmen to improve their wages or working conditions, to illustrate this point.

The decisive influence distorting and restricting the accurate presentation of news and the adequate expression of opinion is " the interests, policies and prejudices of newspaper proprietors." This factor has become the more important the greater the scale of capitalist enterprise and the consequent difficulty, approaching impossibility, of publishing a new daily newspaper.

It should not be imagined this distortion and restriction is due to the whims and prejudices of the proprietors as individuals. It is the monopoly of a class, with its ownership of the means of publication, that prints its stamp on the whole character of what is published and is decisive for the selection of editors, " outside contributors " and journalists.

A further factor is to be found in the interests and influence of advertisers, of which the salient example is the failure of the newspaper press at any time to give adequate publicity to the British Medical Association's exposure of many patent medicines in its report on Secret Remedies.

In this connection there should be examined the part played by the machinery of state as it affects news and views. In the functioning of the law courts, for example, the effect of the law of libel is not only sometimes to protect scoundrels from the fierce light of publicity but also to create an unofficial censorship by printers on periodicals which do not possess their own printing works. The existence of this hidden but none the less effective censorship is seldom mentioned, which is the more reason to weigh the exact effect of the Printing Acts, especially in conjunction with the law of libel, upon Press freedom.

Another aspect of the law courts is the almost complete veto on criticism of judges and magistrates. Unless we are to imagine that " the unjust judge " is a non-existent category, this specially privileged position of the British judicature, this exemption which places them

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

above monarchs, must be regarded as a restriction of adequate expression of opinion.

Apart from these constant factors, there is the varying influence of the Government. The influence of the Government is seen most deleteriously in Foreign Office "handouts" or statements " from official circles," which turn the British newspaper press largely into a claque for good or bad performances of the Foreign Secretary.

These given are the main factors, in comparison with which the prohibitionists, the anti-vivisectionists, anti-noise societies and all such (to whom the Americanism " pressure groups " presumably applies in so far as it has any applicability in Britain) exert only a feeble influence. The same is true for the public who must take what they are given and for the journalists who must do as they are bid—except in so far as the formation, growth and influence of the National Union of Journalists have raised status and professional standards, to the point where under transformed conditions they could readily become a powerful factor against distortion and suppression.

It follows, *a fortiori,* that the concentration of control of organs of the Press in large corporations works against the accurate presentations of news and the adequate expression of opinion.

To remedy this state of affairs, a number of proposals have been listed. All these proposals are practicable, but for the most part are but palliatives, incapable of making a radical change in the condition of the Press, so long as its control by capitalist enterprise continues. The limitation by law of concentrations of ownership or control, whether by managers, editors or others, is no more likely to be successful in the end than the various " trust-busting " laws in the United States have proved during the last fifty years. Capitalism cannot but grow into monopoly, whatever the *legal* forms and devices imposed on it.

Trusts such as have been adopted by *The Times* and the *Economist* remain forms of organisation of monopoly capital, as an examination of the boards of directors will show. The fact that these boards may not interfere in day-to-day management is of little relevance, since: (a) the enterprise must be conducted on such lines as, in a capitalist society, will produce shareholders the profits which can be distributed as dividends, etc.; (b) they cannot help but select editors who, *according to their lights,* are the most " independent," " clear-headed," " brilliant," etc., i.e., who answer to certain class standards.

The creation of a public trust to lease premises and plant to newspaper promoters on terms debarring the trusts from any share in the conduct of the paper, while having a certain value, still leaves the question of the sources from which the " promoters " can secure the necessary means to make the lease effective, and upon which they must rely—in a capitalist society—to make a financial success of their venture.

The proposal for the publication by a public body independent of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Government of a paper devoted to the objective statement of news and opinion, and possibly of controversial comment supplied by or reprinted from the remaining national dailies presupposes the continuation of the "national," i.e. capitalist-owned dailies; and it does not solve the problem of producing revenue which bears down upon a newspaper published in a capitalist society. Subject to these reservations, such a palliative might, in particular circumstances, play some useful part.

The elimination by agreement or legislation of non-journalistic methods of competition such as canvassing, free gifts and insurance might for a time eliminate some of the grosser excrescences of commercialism; but it would not alter the essentially commercial nature of the newspaper enterprise in a capitalist society—with the consequences referred to earlier.

The compulsory publication in every newspaper of a column of comment by an outside critic or expert is not a serious proposal, as the example of the *Sunday Express* shows.

The creation of a Press Council might serve a useful purpose, but could not by definition solve the problem indicated earlier. In present conditions the creation of a Press Institute would add very little to information already available. Their usefulness, in any case, would be largely conditioned by the further development of the National Union of Journalists.

The proposal for the conduct of newspapers or periodicals by associations of (a) readers or (b) newspaper workers—extended to cover all voluntary organisations of a public character (i.e. subject to control by their membership) and excluding ownership by private capital—provides the most favourable line of advance to solution of the problem of freedom of the Press. It should be an enormous step forward, by enacting the necessary legislation towards Press freedom. At the same time it is necessary to recognise the immense power of penetration of capitalist monopoly, which could seek to turn this expedient into a screen for monopoly: and therefore the final success of such a solution depends on its being part of a radical change in the *main* foundations of society, i.e., by the transfer to social ownership of the basic industries, transport, foreign trade and wholesome home trade, with compensation limited at most to a life interest of present owners.

A certain measure of value, promoting the ultimate end of freedom of the Press, without itself effecting it, would be the adoption of a series of measures like those enacted since the liberation of France, viz., annual publication of the names and addresses of all proprietors, directors and of all shareholders, with their holdings and other interests; publication of the names, addresses and other interests of the most responsible editors: publication of the sources and dimensions of advertising revenue, etc.

It might be of value to procure the facts from the Czechoslovak Ministry of Information as to the position of the Press prior to the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

war (or prior to Munich) and the present transformation of Press control and ownership by public bodies.

The LABOUR MONTHLY is a journal of opinion. It is edited from a Marxist viewpoint. This, however, does not preclude the expression in its pages of other points of view. Indeed it invites and encourages the expression of separate opinions on significant questions, especially from the Labour Movement. Thus, to take parliamentarians only, from 1945 till now the LABOUR MONTHLY has printed articles or expressions of opinion from two Peers of Parliament and 25 members of the House of Commons, including *five* Conservatives, two Liberals and one Independent.

As regards contents of newspapers and periodicals, a lot can be said both for papers which only present a particular set of clear cut opinions and for papers which are open to a free discussion of several points of view; but nothing can be said for the present state of affairs when the overwhelming majority of the newspapers voice only one set of opinions which is not that of the majority of the people who voted Labour. As explained above we do publish articles with a viewpoint other than that of the journal's policy: and on the ground that they represent a significant tendency.

The strict separation of news and opinions is a sound principle which is hardly ever practised. For the headlines over the news, the way in which they are selected and presented, etc., all this suggests opinions under the pretext of giving unbiased news. As a journal of opinion we are not concerned to give news as such, except in our Section *Documents of the Month* in which (until the Paper Control reduced the possibility of this being a large or frequently appearing section) we printed in full documents which had received scant treatment in the newspaper Press.

Suppression of relevant facts is certainly as effective a way of distortion as a direct deviation from truth. We believe that the recognised standard attained by the LABOUR MONTHLY during the last 25 years and its reputation achieved in the 55 countries in which it circulates are largely based on the fact that it gives full objective treatment of all public issues. . . .

(Signed) R. PALME DUTT, *Editor.*

(Signed) R. PAGE ARNOT, *Associate Editor.*

The Editor of LABOUR MONTHLY *will be very glad to receive contributions in the form of finished articles or of suggestions and data for articles. The customary proviso must be made that no responsibility is undertaken for manuscripts sent to him nor can he promise to enter into any correspondence regarding contributions not accepted.*

The articles in LABOUR MONTHLY *are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals. New York City, U.S.A., as well as in the annual index in each December issue.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

GERMANY AND MARXISM

[*We have pleasure in printing the text (slightly abridged) of the speech of Colonel Tulpanov to the Second Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany last autumn, which will be found appropriate at the present moment.—Ed. L.M.*]

IN the name of the Soviet Military Administration I cordially greet you and, through you, the almost two millions in the Socialist Unity Party of Germany.

The constructive work of your Party is in accord with the interests of democracy and peace, for which the peoples of the Soviet Union, the only socialist state in the world, are waging a consistent struggle.

The 17 months which have elapsed since the union of the Communist and Social Democratic Parties in the Soviet zone of occupation, and the two and a half years since the collapse of the Hitler regime in Germany—to which, as is known, the Soviet Army also contributed a bit—have clearly demonstrated to the German people and progressive humanity the world over how correct is your policy of unity, of struggle against the splitting of the working class.

In contrast to the others, we are the only military administration that openly and loudly proclaims that it considers it its democratic duty to support those forces and organisations which struggle for the unity of the working class and for a single democratic Germany.

This attitude of ours to the problem of the workers' movement in Germany, to the problem of the unity of all democratic anti-fascist forces striving for a single democratic Germany, an attitude which is different in principle from that of others, derives from the fundamental difference between our Socialist state and the capitalist nature of the other countries occupying Germany.

The Soviet military administration understands that the difficult economic position and the political decomposition, the weakness in the struggle against the remnants of fascism in some parts of Germany, and the fact that those to blame for the fascist aggression and the misfortune of the people—the German monopolists, Junkers and stock exchange speculators—have been able to retain their positions, are the result of the economic and political splitting of Germany. In the unity of Germany on a democratic basis the Soviet Government sees the way out of economic misery and the political guarantee of a democratic development of the country.

We know that you are fighting against the danger of the splitting of Germany into two parts, but observe carefully: today two Germanies have already been formed, and the line of demarcation is quite clearly perceptible. But it is not one dividing the West from the East, or Southern from Northern Germany.

One Germany is the country of all the progressive forces of the working class, peasantry and intelligentsia. This Germany has drawn

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the right lessons from the past, it has resolved to pursue a new, democratic path and to build a new Germany in which there is no longer room for the elements of monopoly capital and junkerdom, for the ideology of Prussianism and National Socialism. This Germany has deep roots in the German people. It is to this Germany, which stands for understanding and friendship with the Soviet Union, and consequently for the safeguarding of peace in Europe, that the future belongs.

The second Germany or—as it is called abroad—Bizonia, is the country of those people who with the support of foreign and especially American capital want to drive the German people once again into the bloody slaughter of the imperialist war that monopoly capital is preparing.

This second Germany is the Germany of Dinkelbach, of Witzleben, of Schlange-Schoeningen—the Germany of all those who are ready to agree to the territorial division of their country for the benefit of their class interests. Not having its roots among the people, this Germany voluntarily or involuntarily becomes a foreign agency, for it recognises that it can only become a power if it treads the path of national betrayal and of international predatory connections with monopoly capital.

The unity of Germany demands the joint efforts not only of its Party but of all democratic, anti-fascist forces of the parties and organisations, it demands the overcoming of this Second Germany by the Germany of the progressive forces. Smoke out the German reaction from all its positions, those positions which, by trickery and utilising the political and economic dismemberment of Germany, it has again got into its hands; smoke it out everywhere before it has succeeded in getting a firm hold!

The historical situation affords your country also far-reaching possibilities of pursuing a peaceful road to a higher social-political system. But this democratic road has to be fought for, not setting out afresh on the old road of opportunist coalition, as one Party well known to us does.

If one follows the press in Germany and outside its borders, one can observe that an ideological and political crusade against Marxism, Socialism and Bolshevism has developed. The German and foreign reactionary newspapers today remind one strongly of the period of the Anti-Comintern pact, of the so-called " crusades " against the Soviet Union—which are not to be confused with the medieval crusades proclaimed by the Popes in the cathedrals of Worms and Speyer and which were directed against Turkey. They remind one of the time when the small countries of Europe were shamefully surrendered and plundered on the basis of an agreement concluded in Munich—not to be confused with the Munich conferences of the present day, where —it is said—a quite different, a modern, foreign atmosphere prevails. Hence, for the socialists in many parts of Germany today things are not easier than for, let us say, the socialists of the times of Marx, who

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

—as is known—was born in what is at present the French zone of occupation of Germany.

I regret very much that the Marxists from the French and some other Western zones of occupation have not been able to come to this Congress. Since, however, in the Soviet occupation zone it is not forbidden to reprint or quote Marx, I would remind you of the words of the " Communist Manifesto ":

> All the powers of old Europe have entered into a holy alliance to exorcise this spectre: Pope and Czar, Metternich and Guizot, French Radicals and German political police.

And since I am no dogmatic Marxist, I would add today: not only the powers of old Europe but also those of new America.

In the zonal Germany of 1947 the campaign against socialism is being pursued against the socialists with modern, progressive means. Some maintain that there can be socialism without Marxism, others again try to prove that there can be Marxism without socialism. A third group have tons of paper put at their disposal for them to prove scientifically that there can be a Workers' Party which renounces both Marxism and socialism. They say that one can have gone beyond capitalism, although one is dependent on alms from capitalism.

Finally, there are even socialists who exert themselves to prove that there is no socialism in the Soviet Union, but State capitalism, and at the same time there are capitalists who stubbornly adhere to the " old theory " that after all there is socialism in the Soviet Union—and all of these are today engaged in the new campaign against the U.S.S.R. We understand where the roots of this campaign are to be found, and, of course, they also understand it.

Henry Wallace, former Vice-President of the United States of America, declared at a meeting of the association of " Progressive Citizens of America " on September 11, 1947: " As far as communism is concerned, we have to note above all that this word has been applied by the reactionaries to every liberal idea. The aim of reaction is to get us to the point of keeping silent for fear of being dubbed 'reds' ". Thus, gentlemen, there are not only two Germanys, but also two Americas.

In view of the fact that a number of Eastern European countries have cut themselves loose from world capitalism, international reaction and its German agency would like to halt the spread of Marxist theory with all the forces at their disposal. But every active worker of a genuine Socialist Workers' Party can declare with pride: all these efforts are in vain—Marxism is not zonal but international.

Marxism is the expression of the most profound interests of the working class. As is well known, Marxism was born in Germany and found a home in the Soviet Union. And the Party of the Marxists in Germany is the Socialist Unity Party of Germany and only the Socialist Unity Party. In vain are all the attempts of the second Germany to forbid the former concentration camp prisoners to celebrate September 14, in vain they take the help of the occupying powers to prevent the Socialist Unity Party of Germany from being allowed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the West, in vain are all their measures, overt or covert, to deny the right of development to the democratic and anti-fascist forces, and in particular the Communist Party in South and West Germany. All these efforts are doomed to failure. No one in the world, not even a Schumacher or Adenauer, has succeeded or will succeed in halting the natural course of history. In spite of all difficulties, the great difficulties which you will still experience, the future belongs to you, the representatives of the new Germany.

100 Years Ago

THE PRAGUE INSURRECTION

At the end of the first week of April, 1848, Marx, accompanied by Engels, W. Wolff, and others, left Paris for Germany. In Mainz they took up with the local Communists the need of a wider agitation for the founding of a workers' union. On 10th April they came to Cologne (their headquarters for the next twelvemonth), where they immediately took over from an existing group the organisation of a new big daily paper. The rest of April and up to the end of May was a crowded period of preparation for publication of the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung". Its prospectus was brought out on 24th April, 1848. The date of the first issue had been planned for 1st July: but, when reaction began to raise its head, Marx decided at the end of May to bring forward the date of publication to 1st June. We print below excerpts from one of the articles in June, 1848.

A new blood-bath of Posen is being prepared in Bohemia. The Austrian soldiery has drowned in Czech blood the possibility of a peaceful co-existence of Bohemia and Germany.

From Wyschehrad and Hradschin, Prince Windischgrätz sends guns against Prague. Military concentration takes place and a coup de main is prepared against the Slav Congress and the Czechs.

The people learn of these armings. They mass in front of the Prince's residence and demand arms. Arms are refused them. Excitement mounts. The armed and unarmed masses increase in size. Then a shot is fired, from the inn opposite the Commandant's palace, and Princess Windischgrätz falls mortally wounded. At once the order to attack is given, the Grenadiers advance, the people are pushed back. But everywhere barricades are erected and bar the way to the soldiers. Guns are moved up and the barricades smashed with grape shot. Blood flows in streams. Fighting goes on throughout the night of the 12th to the 13th and continues on the 13th. Finally the soldiers succeed in capturing the wide thoroughfares and forcing back the people into the narrower parts of the city, where artillery cannot be used.

That is the extent of our latest news. It is added that many

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

members of the Slav Congress have been expelled from the city under strong escort. According to this, the military have, at least partially, won a victory.

However the insurrection ends, a war of annihilation of the Germans against the Czechs is now the only possible solution.

In their revolutions, the Germans have to atone for the sins of their entire past. They have had to pay for them in Italy. In Posen they have once again invited the anathema of all Poland. And now Bohemia is added.

Even where they came as enemies, the French have succeeded in winning recognition and sympathy. The Germans are nowhere recognised, find sympathy nowhere. Even where they come forward as generous apostles of freedom, they are rebuffed with bitter scorn.

And rightly so. A nation which throughout its past has let itself be used as a tool for the suppression of all other nations, such a nation has first to prove that it has really undergone a revolution. It has to prove it otherwise than by a couple of semi-revolutions that have no other result than to allow the continuance in other forms of the old irresoluteness, weakness and disunity: revolutions in which there remains a Radetzky in Milan, a Colomb and Steinäcker in Posen, a Windischgrätz in Prague, a Hüser in Mainz, just as if nothing had happened.

Revolutionary Germany has had to break with its entire past, especially in relation to neighbouring peoples. Simultaneously with its own freedom, it must proclaim the freedom of the peoples which it has hitherto oppressed.

And what has revolutionary Germany done? It has completely confirmed the old oppression by the German soldiery of Italy, Poland, and now also of Bohemia. Kaunitz and Metternich have been fully justified.

And the Germans then demand that the Czechs should trust them?

And fault is found with the Czechs, because they do not want to join a nation that, while it is liberating itself, oppresses and ill treats other nations?

Fault is found with them, because they do not want to send delegates to an Assembly like our wretched, faint-hearted Frankfurt " National Assembly", which trembles at its own sovereignty?

Fault is found with them because they sever their connection with the impotent Austrian government, which in its perplexity and lameness, seems only to be there not to prevent or at least to organise the falling apart of Austria, but to take note of it? A government which is itself too weak to free Prague from the guns and soldiers of a Windischgrätz?

Those most to be pitied, however, are the brave Czechs themselves. Whether they are victorious or are defeated, their downfall is certain. By the 400 years of oppression by the Germans, an oppression now continued in the street fighting in Prague, the Czechs

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been driven into the arms of the Russians. In the great struggle between the West and East of Europe, which very shortly—perhaps in a few weeks—will break out, an unfortunate fate has put the Czechs on the side of the Russians, on the side of despotism against the revolution. The revolution will triumph and the Czechs will be the first to be crushed by it.

It is again the Germans who bear the blame for the downfall of the Czechs. It is the Germans who have betrayed them to Russia.

Book Reviews

The Passing of the "Giant Tortoises"

The Twentieth Century Test, 1884-1912. (Third Volume of the History of *The Times.* 21*s.*).

IN this fascinating volume the story is unfolded, with scholarly leisure, of how *The Times* sank to its lowest point of moral influence and financial difficulty until acquired by Lord Northcliffe by secretive methods, jerked on to a paying basis and the "Old Gang" who had been running the paper finally disposed of.

This history takes us up to 1912 and the fourth volume which continues the tale of *The Times* up to 1935 is promised within the next three years. Many more years must therefore pass before the full account is given of *The Times* support of the Munich policy, a period more shameful in its history than even its connection with the Jameson Raid and its publication of the Pigott forgery.

The writers faithfully record the story of the setting up of the Special Commission by the Government to investigate the charges made in the articles "Parnellism and Crime", the unmasking of Pigott as the forger of a letter allegedly written by Parnell, the heavy burden on *The Times* of a defence which cost £200,000 and the fall in circulation which followed the unfavourable verdict. "Something of the awe of holy writ, which from the days of Barnes had hung about its columns, now faded away".

The Times came out of this case very badly, but they were much more fortunate in 1897, nine years later, when a Select Committee of the House appointed to inquire into the Jameson Raid against the Boers quietly glossed over the role played by that newspaper. It was in the Government's interests to do so. Yet from the evidence given there is not the slightest doubt that *The Times,* through the person of the redoubtable Miss Flora Shaw, the head of its colonial department who was in close touch with Joseph Chamberlain, the Colonial Secretary, became an active organising centre for the imperialist intrigues of Cecil Rhodes. The code telegrams which Miss Shaw sent to Rhodes giving assurances in Chamberlain's name and urging the carrying through of the Raid were in some cases drafted by Moberly Bell, the manager of *The Times,* although Miss Shaw naturally concealed this from the Committee. But the Committee itself did not press the point. The unmasking of *The Times* would have meant also the exposure of Chamberlain. The writers sum up this discreditable episode with observation that as a result of the Committee's report "a domestic political crisis had been avoided. Abroad, however, criticism spared neither Imperial Britain nor *The Times.*"

The role of *The Times* as the faithful upholder of the imperialist interests of Britain is strongly stressed throughout this volume which, somewhat strangely, entirely neglects the home scene during these vital twenty-eight years. The rise of Germany as an imperialist power menacing British imperialist interests and the growing conviction of *The Times* that Britain must prepare for war is told in swift detail by the recounting of the treatment of its various Berlin correspondents,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

especially the most outstanding of them, George Saunders. In 1889, Saunders, writing to the Foreign Editor from Berlin, warned of a war in thirty years and in the following year stated that the Germans "are the only nation which intelligently and of set purpose contemplates a struggle with Great Britain for commercial and colonial predominance." The Germans, apparently, had no illusions regarding Saunders. In 1905 the Kaiser is reported as saying that "Mr. Saunders is a first-class swine".

The final chapters are mainly devoted to the expounding, for the first time, of the dramatic story of the sale of *The Times* to Lord Northcliffe and how that megalomaniac finally succeeded in establishing his domination in spite of the obstinate resistance of the powerful Moberly Bell, an outstanding figure of this volume, who stuck desperately to the outworn methods of a past decade.

The story is exciting but not dignified. If told in fiction it would not be believed. Behind the imposing façade of *The Times* with its brilliant array of foreign correspondents and its stately and pompous articles there went on a sordid financial intrigue dating back to the structure of the company determined by its original chief proprietor, John Walter.

For many years *The Times* had been badly run and its shareholders were in revolt. They rightly believed that the arrangement whereby *The Times* paid for the use of the printing presses which remained the sole property of the Walter family put a great deal of money into the family's pocket at the expense of the shareholders. Court actions tumbled over one another (they actually began in 1838) and negotiations for sale were opened in 1907.

It was at this point that Northcliffe secretly entered the field. Having succeeded with *Answers, Comic Cuts, Home Chat* and the *Daily Mail,* he confessed that his greatest ambition in life was to own *The Times.*

And he achieved this in 1908, when he shouldered Arthur Pearson, his chief competitor, out of the field. It was done by means of an intrigue with Moberly Bell whereby the name of the purchaser, referred to as "X", was kept secret from all concerned for fear that this invasion of the yellow journalist into the dignified realms of *The Times* would meet with a revolt from staff, shareholders and high political circles.

For a time Northcliffe held his hand. He was content to infiltrate his own men, like Kennedy Jones and Nicholson, into leading positions on the staff in order to clean out the cobwebs from its administration and to brighten its news presentatiton. But gradually the "Chief" asserted his power and the pressure became acute. In 1909 he invited Moberly Bell to take a holiday with him in America, the results of which are recorded as follows:

> "If the American trip was a holiday for Northcliffe, it was an experience for his companion. Bell was entertained morning, noon and night to questions, slighting references, criticisms and downright abuse of Printing House Square, its men and methods. 'I have a feeling,' he wrote, 'that I want more rest now than I did when I started.'"

After four years of such tactics and following the death of Moberly Bell and the resignation of the editor, George Buckle, who figures as a somewhat shadowy figure in this history, Northcliffe finally got the paper completely under his control. By 1912 the "Old Gang" or the "giant tortoises", as Northcliffe also described them, were out.

Geoffrey Dawson, the new editor, came in with the instruction to "ignore all existing prejudices and opinions". *The Times* of the last forty years had as its mottoes, wrote Northcliffe, "Abandon Scope all ye who enter here", and "News, like Wine, improves by keeping". Henceforth there was to be a change.

And, indeed, there was. The old poverty-stricken *Times,* with a circulation of merely 47,000, and suffering sharply from the competition of the new journalism, entered a new period. The "barnacle covered whale" was lifted off the financial rocks.

It is not surprising that those who run *The Times* today look back on the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Northcliffe period as the turning point in the history of the paper. "To him *The Times* owes its transformation from a bankrupt nineteenth century relic into a flourishing twentieth century property . . . *The Times* would have floundered without him."

Northcliffe's contribution to the twentieth century aims of British Imperialism was not only the production of his million-sale sheets for the doping of the masses, but also the taking over and remoulding of the main organ of the ruling class for the purpose of upholding the ideology of imperialism.

When Northcliffe died in 1922 he was then a raving lunatic. There had been many signs of an uncontrollable megalomania in earlier years and this end was not unexpected. But from the story of the embalmed conservatism of the "Monks" of Printing House Square it certainly does appear that only a megalomaniac could have succeeded in carrying out the mighty task of transforming *The Times* from "a diplomatic gazette, a university register, a court circular", into a modern and influential organ of the British ruling class.

WILLIAM RUST.

Useful Book on Housing

Housing and the Family by M. J. Elsas (Meridian Books, 8*s* 6*d*, 136 pp.).

A BOOK which carefully collects and examines all the available evidence as to actual housing needs is useful at the moment—it puts the proposed housing cuts into perspective.

The intention of Mr. Elsas's book is to examine the existing housing situation in the light of its effect on population trends. He estimates that 3,392,000 dwellings in England and Wales (29 per cent.) are 80 years old or more; that more than half of all dwellings were built during the last century, and practically none of these are up to modern standards. And he reminds us that "modern standards" merely means indoor water supply and w.c., adequate light and ventilation, and—that rarity in many districts—a bath. He examines overcrowding statistics, and suggests that in 1939 there were 600,000 families living "doubled-up" with another family in the same dwelling (this does not include single lodgers). How many families are sharing houses now is anyone's guess.

Finally, he estimates that 6.8 million new houses will be needed over the next 20 years. (This, it should be noted, presupposes an *average* production of 340,000 houses a year; and if the housing cuts go through, we shall be down to 14,000!)

Mr. Elsas rightly stresses the need for a more flexible policy in local authority building. The concentration (overwhelming in some towns) on the building of 3-bedroomed dwellings has meant that the needs of large families are not satisfied; meanwhile existing council house tenants have either deliberately limited their families to the size of house or else themselves become overcrowded as their families increased or the children grew older. At the opposite end of the scale, there is an acute shortage of one and two-roomed dwellings for

Le Corbusier

The Four Routes

An examination by one of the most distinguished architects of our time of the four principal means of communication. The author is concerned not only with the functional aspect of his subject, but also with its important sociological implications. He sets out with vigour and precision theories which are based on a lifetime of work all over the world, and justly claims for his conclusions the accuracy of laboratory tests.

ILLUSTRATED AVAILABLE 15s net

Current book list on request from
12 Park Place, St. James's, London, SW1

Dennis Dobson Ltd

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

old people, which will grow steadily worse as the population grows older. It is not the author's fault that these chapters, written some months ago, may now appear somewhat academic to local authorities who are fighting with their backs to the wall to be allowed to build anything at all.

The book is marred by its conclusions. One of Mr. Elsas's solutions is a comprehensive rent rebate system, embracing not just council tenants, but the whole population, which would scale down rents according to income, in particular to allow for larger families to occupy larger dwellings, thus removing an essential obstacle to an increased birth-rate.

The trouble with advocates of rent rebate schemes is that they nearly always start with the basic assumption that high rents and low wages are inevitable. With official encouragement from the Minister of Health, rent rebate schemes now appear to be growing more fashionable among local authorities, with all that they involve in the way of Means Tests, and higher rents for the "better-off" workers to make up for the lower rents of the others. The more such a policy gains ground, the more it will tend to cover up the root causes of the trouble—high building and land costs on the one hand, and inadequate wages on the other.

NOREEN BRANSON.

LOOK OUT FOR MAY ISSUE OF LABOUR MONTHLY — AND ORDER EARLY.

Shorter Notice

The Quality of Education, edited by Denys Thompson and James Reeves (Fredk. Muller, Ltd., 8*s* 6*d*).

THIS volume consists of a number of essays on the teaching of secondary school subjects, each written by a practising teacher. The editors and others contribute chapters on the "integration" of the curriculum—a question rightly to the fore at the present time. It is claimed that the contributors are sufficiently agreed on general principles to "enable them to deal with particular subjects from a common standpoint".

What is this "common standpoint"? It appears to be a somewhat vague acknowledgment that there ought to be qualitatively more democracy, a general dislike of the way the world is in fact changing, and a search for a "defence against an environment which is destructive of personality". When we come down to cases the insufficiency becomes clear, e.g. in Mr. Hampden Jackson's contribution on History:

> "At each stage historians have needed a myth, a creative legend, in order to impose a pattern on the events of the past and to give themselves a principle of selection. . . . But that is the trouble. We cannot agree on a myth . . . We await a new myth."

So soon does such a slender integration disintegrate. Otherwise there is a good deal of interesting and useful material on the actual practice of teaching.

A. G. P.

PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

BOOKS

Road to Reaction. Herman Finer. Dennis Dobson. 8s. 6d. 131 pp.
The Spirit of Post-War Russia. Rudolf Schlesinger. Dennis Dobson. 8s. 6d. 187 pp.
Echo of the Himalayas. Chowdry Akbar Khan. Oriental Books. 6s. 229 pp.
A History of Savings Banks. H. Oliver Horne. O.U.P. (Cumberlege). 18s. 407 pp.
Die Geschichte der Lage der Arbeiter in Deutschland. Jurgen Kuczynski. Die Freie Gewerkschaft. Berlin. 292 pp.
The Building Industry. Harry Barham. St. Botolph Publ. Co., Ltd. 5s. 99 pp.

BOOKLETS

Report on the All-India Trade Union Congress. A.I.T.U.C., R.L. Trust Building, Bombay. 3 Rupees. 186 pp.
The New Czechoslovak Miners' Pensions Insurance. Orbis, Prague. 30 pp.
The Youth of Czechoslovakia. Central Committee of the Youth of the Czechoslovak Republic. 62 pp.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to me in the critical days of 1926-1931. Could I pass on my finished copy to someone who cannot pay for it?"

Yes, indeed. Members of the forces, political prisoners abroad and others constantly appeal to us for recent back numbers. Here is a letter from a German anti-fascist, a regular reader when she was a refugee in Britain, whom currency regulations prevent from renewing her subscription. She writes: from the British Zone in Germany:

> "You may be sure that it was not an oversight on my part not to renew the subscription, but my inability to pay from here. I cannot ask my friends in England to give me a subscription, as the rising cost of living and their other obligations would make it impossible for them to face any additional burden. Please believe me that I am always exceedingly interested in the articles you publish, and I am convinced that we Germans need clear exposition of the forces at work in our society perhaps more than any other people. Would it be possible for you to note me down for old issues, similarly to the scheme you ran for the Forces?" —S. R. B.

Those who are willing to pass on their copy to people like this German anti-fascist, to members of the Forces, and to political prisoners, should write for particulars to the Manager, 134 Ballards Lane, N.3.

Readers in the neighbourhood of Maghull, Lancashire, who would like to join a newly-formed "Labour Monthly" Discussion Group, are asked to get in touch with the office immediately. Incidentally, news is coming in, especially from several rural areas, about the formation of such groups.

It is pleasant to get words of good cheer from our readers. They have certainly been pouring into the "Labour Monthly" of late. Appreciative letters—in all languages—from readers in India, Australia, South Africa, Latin America, the Scandinavian countries, Europe—just about all over the world. A pleasant note has been the keenness of readers in North America to help us extend our circulation; they feel it is important to them, as well as to us. Just a few extracts:

> *"Why don't you widen your drive for U.S. subscribers? We have nothing quite so good. I particularly enjoyed Arthur Horner's piece. Here are five names and addresses of friends of mine who ought to be readers."* (*T. H., Virginia*).
>
> *"I consider it to be one of the most authoritative expressions of working class opinion in England. Palme Dutt's analyses of international affairs are models of clear, straightforward thinking."—(H. A., Indiana).*
>
> *". . . some of the finest political writing appearing today."—(R. B., Philadelphia).*
>
> *"I find the 'Labour Monthly' very satisfactory in helping me to understand the world situation."—(M. H., Los Angeles).*

And we appreciate and value such friends. Welcoming the ever-growing numbers of new readers, we watch eagerly for the old stalwarts who pay their compliments each month in the form of a regular donation. Many can no longer afford to pay out a yearly subscription; they are renewing for six months at a time. And some have to reduce their monthly gifts. As costs are ever rising, that means the burden must be spread. We must look for more gifts from the newer comers to lift the weight off the old supporters.

This month, heading the list of donations received between January 1 and February 29, are two of our oldest friends: Commander Harold Grenfell, R.N., whose obituary appears on page 111, and Mr. S. B., an Old Age Pensioner.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

	£	s.	d.
Late Cdr. Harold Grenfell, R.N.	5	5	0
Mr. S.B., Old-Age Pensioner ...		1	0
G. M. Harrison	2	5	0
E. D. McCallum		5	0
L. Rowan		6	0
Wm. E. Robertson		3	0
W. L. Humphreys		3	6
R.F.B.	3	0	0
D. M. Clarke		10	0
Queenie Elliot		6	0
S. Mill		10	0
E. Winstanley			6
J. S. Munro		9	0
J. Lipetz	1	10	0
E. J. Stout		8	0
L'Humanite		2	0
A. C. Carte		5	0
G. E. and M. F. Philibert		10	0
T. Flood		2	6
Mrs. M. Simon			6
Mr. R. Webber		8	0
J. C. McAlister		8	0
P. Cox		4	0
W. S. Hamp		8	0
V. Ljubiea		8	0
J. A. Turner		1	0
Mr. J. Drummond		10	0
H. S. Marshall		6	0
R. S. Anderson		5	0
H. R. Davis		2	0
Olivia Greene	2	0	0
C. Jones		7	0
Mr. and Mrs. Shapiro		8	0
L. R. Borsley		8	0
Anon. (Whitchurch)		1	0
D. Williams		3	0
F. Renouf		5	0
Peter Tole		3	0
D. H. Strathern and Friends ...		5	0
D. H. Strathern		8	0
Les. Bates		4	0
W. F. Lakin-Smith		2	6
F. Wedlake		2	6
S. Morrisey		9	6
Royston Green		3	0
D. Rees		8	0
A. L. Beak		3	0
J. B., Chelmsford		5	0
R. McLeod		5	0
T.W.R., Oxford	1	0	0
Dr. N. MacDonald		8	0
Cambridge C.P.	1	7	0
E. D. McCallum		5	0
L. Rowan		6	0
J. J. Trott		4	0
D. M. Clarke		10	0
E. White		2	6
P. Leplar		8	0

	£	s.	d.
A. Walker		8	0
W. F. Lakin-Smith		2	6
Wm. Charters		1	0
Royston Green		3	6
S. Mill		10	0
Communist because Christian	1	0	0
Anon. (Whitchurch)		1	0
Mrs. K. Kennedy		2	6
Mr. F. W. Thompson		8	0
Cambridge C.P.	1	7	6
Wm. H. Allen		9	0
M. Lane		6	9
R. Leadbetter		8	0
J. B. Simpson		8	0
Mrs. O. Mangeot		2	6
J. Gray		8	0
T. Flood		2	6
Mr. J. Hunter		8	0
R.F.B.	3	0	0
Donald Clarke		3	0
Dr. M. Joffe		7	0
R. Trowell		4	0
N. L. Dodsworth		8	0
L'Humanite		2	0
Socialist Sailor	1	0	0
P. L. Brinson		10	0
Director	2	0	0
Director	2	0	0
J. A. Purton		5	0
F. Clarke		9	8
H.S.M.		2	6
Mr. W. Kelsall		8	0
J.B.		8	0
Mrs. G. M. Lea		8	0
G. E. and M. F. A. Philibert ...		10	0
H. N. Humphreys		3	6
D. H. Strathern		5	0
Olivia Greene	2	0	0
Miss Pratt		8	0
H. A. Percival		4	0
R. Anderson		10	0
S. Morrisey		10	0
S. Datta		3	0
B. Lawson		18	0
R. McLeod		5	0
D. H. Lewin		9	6
F. Renouf		5	0
R. G. Bensans	1	0	0
Socialist Sailor	1	0	0
P. N. Brinson		10	0
J. Purton		5	0
W. M. Davies		9	0
Mr. L. Youatt		12	0
H.G.K.		4	0
G.R.S.	1	8	0
	£60	13	11

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

I wish to become a postal subscriber to LABOUR MONTHLY and enclose 12/- (Home)
13/- (Abroad) **to cover twelve months' subscription beginning with the**

.....**issue.**

NAME..... **ADDRESS**.....

(Please use Block Capitals)

.....

.....

Published by the Proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Dorchester and District Newspapers, Ltd. (T.U.), Dorchester, Great Britain.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED